



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,285	01/31/2001	Shane Kuipers	Haworth Case 306	1964

7590 10/23/2002

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.
2026 Rambling Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1699

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3635	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/773,285 Examiner YVONNE M. HORTON	Applicant(s) SHANE KUIPERS ET AL.	
---	---	---

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 31, 2001
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims
- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 8-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 7, 14, 17-19, 22, and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-6, 15, 16, 20, and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 3635

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent #5,038,539 to KELLEY et al. KELLEY et al. discloses an office furniture arrangement including repositionable office components (12,14) having a furniture frame (40) and glass panel (30d) wherein the glass panel (30d) includes a frame (38) and a glass sheet (38a). The glass panel frame (38) includes edge frame rail members (288,290,292) having a fixing channel (298) and opposite glass faces (294,296). The opposing glass faces (294,296) have either a foam coating or a pressure sensitive adhesive thereon, column 15, lines 35 and 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3635

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1,7,14,17,18,22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #5,038,539 to KELLEY et al. KELLEY et al. discloses an office furniture arrangement including repositionable office components (12,14) having a furniture frame (40) and glass panel (30d) wherein the glass panel (30d) includes a frame (38) and a glass sheet (38a). The glass panel frame (38) includes edge frame rail members (288,290,292) having a fixing channel (298) and opposite glass faces (294,296). KELLEY et al. discloses the basic claimed office furniture except for explicitly detailing the material that the glass panel frame members are made from. Although KELLEY et al. is silent in this regard, it is old and very well known in the art to form office furniture frame elements out of metal or plastic. Both of these materials display a certain amount of ability to deflect. Thus, in reference to claims 1,14 and 22, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that

Art Unit: 3635

the frame of the glass panel have the ability to deflect in order to tightly fit within the office furniture frame (40). Regarding claims 7,17 and 23, the glass sheet (38a) is rectangular in shape wherein the vertical side thereof are supported by the channels (298). In reference to claim 18, the frame (38) also includes bottom (292) and top rails (290) fixed thereto by connector parts (310,314,318).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 8-13 are allowed.
7. Claims 2-6,15,16,20 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach the use of a glass panel and frame member for insert into the frame of an office furniture; wherein, the glass panel frame member includes projections that contact the panel face and wherein the channel formed in the glass panel frame member includes undercuts formed in an end face thereof..
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1909.

YMH
Patent Examiner
October 21, 2002

